

REMARKS

In the Office Action Made Final, dated June 24, 2005, the Examiner stated that all previous rejections were withdrawn except for an obviousness-type double patenting rejection. With respect to the obviousness-type double patenting rejection, the Examiner stated that, despite Applicants statement to the contrary, a properly executed terminal disclaimer had not been filed with Applicants' previous response (filed April 1, 2005, and received April 4, 2005). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner; a terminal disclaimer was mailed to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on April 1, 2005, and entered on April 4, 2005, along with Applicants' amendment of the same date. A copy of the terminal disclaimer and its accompanying transmittal and statement under 37 C.F.R. § 3.73(b) as filed, and a copy of our postcard receipt date-stamped by the PTO, are attached. Also attached are copies of the terminal disclaimer and statement under 37 C.F.R. § 3.73(b), as printed from PAIR (located under the line item "Rule 131 or 132 Affidavits").

Applicants respectfully request that the remaining rejection of the pending claims be withdrawn, thereby putting the application in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By 

N. Scott Pierce

Registration No. 34,900

Telephone: (978) 341-0036

Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated: 11/11/05